arXiv:1406.5955v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 23 Jun 2014

Simple universal models capture all spin physics

Gemma De las Cuevas[1] and Toby S. Cubitt[2,3]
[1]*Max Planck Institute for Quantum Optics, Hans-Kopfermann-Str. 1, D-85748 Garching, Germany*
[2]*DAMTP, University of Cambridge, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom*
[3]*Departamento de Análisis Matemático, Facultad de CC Matemáticas, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Plaza de Ciencias 3, 28040 Madrid, Spain*

Spin models are used in virtually every study of complex systems—be it condensed matter physics [1–4], neural networks [5] or economics [6, 7]—as they exhibit very rich macroscopic behaviour despite their microscopic simplicity. It has long been known that by coarse-graining the system, the low energy physics of the models can be classified into different universality classes [8]. Here we establish a counterpart to this phenomenon: by "fine-graining" the system, we prove that all the physics of *every* classical spin model is exactly reproduced in the low energy sector of certain 'universal models'. This means that (i) the low energy spectrum of the universal model is identical to the entire spectrum of the original model, (ii) the corresponding spin configurations are exactly reproduced, and (iii) the partition function is approximated to any desired precision. We prove necessary and sufficient conditions for a spin model to be universal, which show that complexity in the ground state alone is sufficient to reproduce full energy spectra. We use this to show that one of the simplest and most widely studied models, the 2D Ising model with fields, is universal.

The description of systems with many interacting degrees of freedom is a ubiquitous problem across the natural and social sciences. Be it electrons in a material, neurons interacting through synapses, or speculative agents in a market [8], the challenge is to simplify the system so that it becomes tractable while capturing some of the relevant features of the real system. This challenge is met, among others, by spin models. Originally introduced in condensed matter physics to study magnetic materials—yielding much insight into frustration [2], disorder [3] and phase transitions [8]—spin models have nowadays permeated many disciplines as a tool to tackle complex systems: In physics, they are used to describe e.g. alloys [8], gases and liquids using lattice gas models [8], toy models of matter in discrete models of quantum gravity [9], error-correcting codes [7], and percolation theory [8]; in mathematics, the Potts model—a generalisation of the Ising model—is related to the Tutte polynomial [10], and to the colouring problem in graph theory [10]; in artificial intelligence, they have been used to model neural networks [5], memory models, machine learning, and image restoration [7]; in biology, they have been used to study prebiotic evolution [6] and protein folding [11]; and in economics, they are used to model trading in stock markets [12].

The reason for this success is that, microscopically they are simple, yet their versatile interactions lead to a very rich macroscopic behaviour. More precisely, a spin model is specified by a set of degrees of freedom (with q internal levels), the "spins", and a cost function or Hamiltonian H which specifies the interaction pattern as well as the type and strength of interactions among the spins. Naturally, this definition encompasses a huge class of models, including, e.g., attractive and/or repulsive interactions, regular and irregular interaction patterns, models in different spatial dimensions, with different symmetries (e.g. "conventional" spin models with global symmetries, versus models with local symmetries, such as lattice gauge theories), many-body interactions (as in e.g. vertex models and edge models [13]), and more. We will use the word "model" to refer to a family of spin Hamiltonians (generally infinite) which are typically related in some natural way—for example, the "2D Ising model with fields" is the family of Ising models with local fields on a 2D square lattice with inhomogeneous couplings and fields.

One of the most important insights of modern theoretical physics is that if one coarse-grains and eliminates the inessential short-range details of a model, the macroscopic features of the model are revealed, and one observes that unrelated physical materials behave in a similar, universal way near a phase transition. This has led to the classification of Hamiltonians into different universality classes [8].

Here we show a counterpart to this phenomenon: there exist certain models, which we call 'universal', whose low energy sector can reproduce the complete physics of *any* other spin model. More precisely, we say that a spin model with Hamiltonian H 'simulates' another one H' if there exists a choice of parameters of H such that (i) the energy levels of H below a threshold Δ are identical to the energy levels of H', (ii) there is a fixed subset S of the spins of H whose configuration for each energy level below Δ is identical to the spin configuration of the corresponding energy level of H', and (iii) the partition function of H equals that of H' up to an exponentially small term in Δ [31]. A spin model is 'universal' if it can simulate *any* other spin Hamiltonian H', with at most a polynomial overhead in the number of spins and parameters (see the Supplementary Information for more detail). Thus universal models exhibit all possible phases, critical phenomena, complex energy landscape, etc. in some region of its phase diagram, depending on the choice of its parameters (see Fig. 1).

This definition of Hamiltonian simulation is very strong, and the ability to simulate *any* other Hamiltonian seems very demanding. Do any such universal models exist? To show that they do, we will first establish necessary and sufficient



FIG. 1: **a**, A spin model is universal if and only if it its ground state energy problem admits a faithful reduction from SAT and it is closed. This means that there exists a fine-graining procedure from any spin model —including models with many-body interactions, long-range interactions, or defined on high dimensional lattices— that transforms it to the low-energy sector of the universal model. On the other hand, coarse-graining different spin models leads to a classification into different universality classes. **b**, For any spin Hamiltonian, the parameters of the universal model can be chosen so that its spectrum below a threshold Δ is identical to the entire spectrum of the target Hamiltonian. Moreover, the spin configuration of each energy level, σ_j, is reproduced in a subset of the spins of the universal model. Finally (not shown) the two partition functions are identical up to a rescaling and an exponentially small factor in Δ.

conditions for a model to be universal. With this in hand, we will show that one of the most widely studied spin models, the 2D Ising model with fields, is universal.

Our first condition relates to the computational complexity of the ground state energy (GSE) problem of the spin model, which asks whether the ground state energy of the system is below some given value K. It is a classic result that the GSE problem for general spin models is NP-complete [14]. This can be proven by showing that the well-known NP-complete SAT problem [32] can be encoded into the GSE problem (there is a polynomial-time reduction from SAT to GSE). More precisely, given a boolean formula ϕ, we can construct a spin Hamiltonian H such that ϕ is satisfiable if and only if there is a spin configuration σ such that $H(\sigma) \leq K$, where H and K are determined by ϕ, and the number of spins and parameters in H is at most polynomially larger than the number of boolean variables. We will require a slightly stronger condition: a *faithful* reduction from SAT. This should additionally preserve the structure of the problem solution, in the sense that the values of the variables in the satisfying assignment should be in one-to-one correspondence with the states of a subset of the spins in the ground state configuration of the Hamiltonian.

Our second condition is essentially a minimal requirement for a collection of Hamiltonians to meaningfully form part of the same spin 'model'. We say that a model is *closed* if, for any pair of Hamiltonians H^1_{AB} and H^2_{BC} in the model acting on arbitrary sets of spins A, B, and C, there is another Hamiltonian H in the model that simulates $H^1_{AB} + H^2_{BC}$. If the model places no constraints on the interaction pattern (for example, it is the set of Ising models on any graph), then it is trivially closed. Closure is only a non-trivial property if the interaction pattern of the spins is restricted in some way (e.g. to a lattice).

Intuitively, the first condition guarantees that the model is sufficiently rich, while closure allows large systems to be built up by combining basic building blocks.

Now we are ready to state our main technical result: *A spin model is universal if and only if its ground state energy problem admits a faithful, polynomial-time reduction from* SAT*, and it is closed.*

In the following we present the main ideas of the proof. (Full technical details are given in the Supplementary Information.) The "only if" direction is straightforward. The closure part follows from the definition of a universal model: this must be able to simulate *any* H^1_{AB}, H^2_{BC} and $H = H^1_{AB} + H^2_{BC}$, including any H^1_{AB} and H^2_{BC} that are in the universal model itself. The faithful reduction part follows from the fact that the universal model must be able to simulate the 2D Ising model with fields, which itself admits a faithful reduction from SAT [14].

The "if" direction is less obvious. Let us first assume for simplicity that H has single-body terms with tuneable strength, and that both H and the model that is to be simulated, H', have two-level spins. We take one k-body term h' in the target Hamiltonian H', and expand it as

$$h'(\sigma') = \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} E_i e_i(\sigma'), \tag{1}$$

where e_i is the elementary basis of Boolean functions: $e_i(y) = 1$ if and only if $i = y$. The idea is to "localise" the information contained in the spin configuration σ' in some additional "flag" spins σ_{b_i}, whose state indicates whether σ' is in configuration i or not. To this end, we consider the boolean formula

$$e_i(\sigma_S) \odot \sigma_{b_i}, \tag{2}$$

where $\odot$ denotes the exclusive-nor operation (i.e. $x \odot y = 1$ if and only if $x = y$ for boolean variables x, y). We apply the faithful reduction to transform the satisfiability problem of (2) to the GSE problem of a Hamiltonian H^i_1 from our model. (Note that we can always rescale and shift the origin of energy so that the ground state has energy 0 and the next lowest energy level is > 1.) H^i_1 then has the following properties

$$\begin{cases} \Delta H^i_1(\sigma) = 0 & \sigma_{b_i} = e_i(\sigma_S),\ \sigma_{A_i} \in \Sigma_{A_i} \\ \Delta H^i_1(\sigma) \geq \Delta & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where Σ_{A_i} is a set of spin configurations of any auxiliary spins A_i that are introduced by the reduction, and we choose $\Delta > \max_i E_i$. Thus, in the spin configurations with energy below Δ, we have $\sigma_{b_i} = e_i(\sigma_S)$. That is $\sigma_{b_i} = 1$ if and only if $\sigma_S = i$, and $\sigma_{b_i} = 0$ otherwise.

Since we are assuming that the model contains single-body terms with arbitrary strength, we now just need to choose the local magnetic field on spin σ_{b_i} to have strength E_i and construct the Hamiltonian:

$$H(\sigma) = \Delta \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} H_1^i(\sigma) + \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} E_i \sigma_{b_i} \,. \tag{4}$$

The configuration $\sigma_S = x, \sigma_{b_i} = e_i(\sigma_S), \sigma_{A_i} \in \Sigma_{A_i}$ for all i, has energy E_x for any x, and all other configurations give energy $> \Delta$. Thus the low-energy sector of H exactly reproduces that of h'. Finally, to simulate the entire Hamiltonian H', we simulate each term h' separately, and combine them using the closure property.

What about the general case, in which we cannot assume that the model has locally tuneable magnetic fields (single-body terms)? The argument in this case is more involved, but applies the same general ideas. We use two more faithful reductions from other boolean formulas, and combine them in such a way as to reproduce the effect of the single-body term in the above construction. Finally, to ensure that the partition functions are the same, we modify the above construction to ensure that each energy level introduces the same degeneracy d of the auxiliary spins. In this way, the partition function is given by $Z_H(\beta) = d \sum_{E_i<\Delta} e^{-\beta E_i} + \sum_{E_i \geq \Delta} e^{-\beta E_i} = dZ_{H'} + O(e^{-\Delta})$, so the partition function approximates that of H' up to rescaling, with error exponentially small in Δ. (See the Supplementary Information for full technical details.)

Note that it is a trivial observation that a spin model whose GSE problem is NP-complete can encode the GSE problem of any other spin model, since the latter is in NP. Our result, however, shows that a spin model whose GSE problem is NP-complete is rich enough to reproduce the *entire* energy spectrum *and* spin configurations of any other model, which is much stronger. Indeed, it is remarkable that complexity in the ground state alone is a signature of the ability to simulate all the physics of any other model. NP-completeness of the GSE problem is a non-trivial property, so it is interesting to note that for some classes of models a complete complexity classification is known [15].

We do *not* need to know the energy levels and configurations of the overall Hamiltonian H' in order to simulate it. It is sufficient to know the energy levels and spin configurations of the individual Hamiltonian terms h', and these can always be computed efficiently. It is easily seen from this that the construction is efficient in the number of parameters required to describe the Hamiltonian. Namely, if a target Hamiltonian H' on n spins is composed of m separate k-body terms, then H' is simulated by a Hamiltonian H on $\mathrm{poly}(n, m, 2^k)$ spins specified by $\mathrm{poly}(m, 2^k)$ parameters, and the required parameters for H can be computed efficiently.

We have succeeded in characterising universal models. But do there exist any spin models that fulfil these two conditions? In fact, the conditions are less stringent than they might appear. A simple but very important example is the 2D Ising model with local fields, whose Hamiltonian has the form:

$$H(\sigma) = \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j + \sum_j h_j \sigma_j \tag{5}$$

(where the first sum is over neighboring spins in a 2D square lattice). That it admits a faithful reduction is immediate from chaining together Karp's reduction from SAT to Vertex Cover [16] with Barahona's reduction from Vertex Cover to the GSE problem for the model [14]. (A direct proof of this classic result was also recently given in [17], who showed that the Ising model can encode any (classical) computation.) The fact that the model is closed follows from the "crossing gadget" used in the reduction from Vertex Cover to Planar Vertex Cover [18], together with the fact that the ferromagnetic Ising interaction can be used to force the configurations of neighbouring spins to be identical in the ground state. Thus, our result implies that the 2D Ising model with fields is universal. This means that all classical spin physics is reproduced in the phase diagram of this simple model.

Our characterisation of universal models implies and explains the recently found "completeness results" (where a model was called "complete" if its partition function can equal (up to a factor) the partition function of any other model [19]): any universal model is complete by choosing $\Delta = \infty$. The 2D Ising model with fields with (somewhat unphysical) *imaginary* coupling strengths and fields [19, 20], the 3D Ising model only for a *restricted* class of models [21], and the *four* dimensional Ising lattice gauge theory [22] were all shown to be complete in this sense, and similar results were found for ϕ^4 theories [23] and models with continuous variables [24]. These hitherto ad hoc results are explained by the fact that all of these models satisfy our closure and faithful reduction conditions, hence are universal. Our results prove that the 2D Ising model with physical *real*-valued coupling strengths and fields is not only complete, but can also reproduce the entire energy spectrum and corresponding spin configurations.

In a sense, the role of universal models for classical spin Hamiltonians is analogous to that of universal Turing Machines for classical computation (see Fig. 2). Just as choosing the input to a universal Turing Machine allows it to simulate any other computation, choosing the parameters of a universal model allows it to simulate any other Hamiltonian H'. Our proof is constructive: it provides the parameters needed for the universal model to simulate H'—indeed, these parameters can be computed efficiently from the description of H'.

This suggests a potential application of universal models in experimental studies of complex systems, such as optical lattices and others [25]: if the experimental system is able to implement some universal model—and one can choose whichever universal model is experimentally convenient—then the system is able in principle to reproduce the physics of *any* classical model, with only polynomial overhead. For example,



FIG. 2: Computation vs. Hamiltonian simulation. (Left) Any given Turing machine computes some function $f(x)$ of its input x. Knowing the transition rules of a specific Turing Machine, we can choose the input to a Universal Turing machine in such a way that it simulates the original machine (at the expense of a polynomial overhead). (Right) Similarly, any given spin Hamiltonian assigns an energy $H(\sigma)$ to each spin configuration σ. Knowing the energy levels of the individual terms of a specific Hamiltonian, we can choose the parameters of a universal model in such a way that it simulates the original Hamiltonian (at the expense of a polynomial enlargement).

the physics of a 3D model with many-body interactions on a complex lattice can in principle be simulated using a simpler 2D nearest-neighbour model. Applying this approach in practice would require carefully choosing and optimising a universal model for the specific experimental setup, opening up an promising new line of investigation.

It is interesting to ask whether such (efficient) universal models exist for the simulation of quantum Hamiltonians, especially given the substantial interest in experimental simulations of quantum many-body models. The QMA-completeness of various important quantum Hamiltonians [26, 27] and the ability to efficiently simluate Hamiltonian dynamics [28], together with recent ideas on how to simulate the low-energy spectrum of one QMA-complete Hamiltonian with another [29, 30] could pave the way to quantum generalisations of our results.

Acknowledgements. We thank D. Pérez-García, W. Dür and M. Van den Nest for discussions. GDLC acknowledges support from the Alexander von Humboldt foundation and SIQS. TSC is supported by the Royal Society. The authors declare no competing financial interests.

[1] R. J. Baxter, *Exactly solvable models in statistical mechanics* (Academic Press Limited, San Diego, CA, 1982).
[2] H. T. Diep, ed., *Frustrated Spin Systems* (World Scientific, 2004).
[3] K. Binder and W. Knob, *Glassy materials and disordered solids* (World Scientific, 2005).
[4] H. E. Stanley, *Introduction to Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena* (Oxford University Press, 1971).
[5] R. Rojas, *Neural networks–A systematic introduction* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996).
[6] M. Mézard, G. Parisi, and M. A. Virasoro, *Spin glass theory and beyond* (World scientific, Teaneck, NJ, USA, 1987).
[7] H. Nishimori, *Statistical Physics of Spin Glasses and Information Processing: An Introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2001).
[8] H. Nishimori and G. Ortiz, *Elements of Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena* (Oxford University Press, USA, 2011).
[9] J. Ambjø rn, K. N. Anagnostopoulos, R. Loll, and I. Pushinka, Nucl. Phys. B **807**, 251 (2009).
[10] B. Bollobás, *Modern Graph Theory* (Springer, 1998).
[11] J. D. Bryngelson and P. G. Wolynes, PNAS **84**, 7524 (1987).
[12] S. N. Durlauf, PNAS **96**, 10582 (1999), ISSN 0027-8424.
[13] G. De las Cuevas, J. Phys. B **46**, 243001 (2013).
[14] F. Barahona, J. Phys. A **15**, 3241 (1982).
[15] N. Creignou, J. Comput. System Sci. **51**, 522 (1995).
[16] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson, *Computers and intractability* (W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1979).
[17] M. Gu and A. Perales, Physical Review E **86**, 011116 (2012), ISSN 1539-3755.
[18] M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson, and L. Stockmeyer, Theoretical Computer Science **1**, 237 (1976).
[19] M. Van den Nest, W. Dür, and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 110501 (2008).
[20] V. Karimipour and M. H. Zarei, Physical Review A **86**, 052303 (2012), ISSN 1050-2947.
[21] G. De las Cuevas, W. Dür, M. Van den Nest, and H. J. Briegel, J. Stat. Mech. p. P07001 (2009).
[22] G. De las Cuevas, W. Dür, H. J. Briegel, and M. A. Martin-Delgado, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 230502 (2009).
[23] V. Karimipour and M. H. Zarei, Physical Review A **85**, 32316 (2012), ISSN 1050-2947.
[24] Y. Xu, G. De las Cuevas, W. Dür, H. J. Briegel, and M. A. Martin-Delgado, J. Stat. Mech. p. P02013 (2011).
[25] Nat. Phys. [Special issue on Quantum Simulation] **8**, 263 (2012).
[26] N. Schuch and F. Verstraete, Nature Physics **5**, 732 (2009), ISSN 1745-2473.
[27] A. M. Childs, D. Gosset, and Z. A. K. Webb, pp. 1–83 (2013), arXiv:1311.3297v1.
[28] S. Lloyd, Science **273**, 1073 (1996).
[29] J. Kempe, A. Kitaev, and O. Regev, SIAM J. Comput. **35**, 1070 (2006).
[30] T. Cubitt and A. Montanaro, pp. 1–43 (2013), arXiv:1311.3161v1.
[31] Note that, trivially, H simulates H' if H is more general than H'—for example, the 3D Ising model can simulate the 2D Ising model. What is a priori not clear is that the opposite can occur.
[32] The SAT problem asks: given a boolean formula, is there an assignment to the variables such that the formula evaluates to true (is 'satisfiable').

arXiv:1406.5955v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 23 Jun 2014

Supplementary Information

Here we will prove the main result of this work. Let us start by fixing some notation and definitions. We will call a set of spin Hamiltonians a "spin model" (or simply "model"). Typically, this set will be infinite, and all the Hamiltonians in it will be related in some way. We will also generally assume that the interactions are inhomogeneous. For example, the planar Ising model is the set of all Hamiltonians with 2-body Ising-type interactions between pairs of spins and a planar interaction graph. The 2D Ising model additionally restricts the interaction graph to be a 2D square lattice. Thus, a Hamiltonian in the family of the 2D Ising model with fields is specified by the size of the lattice and the set of coupling strengths.

We will assume without loss of generality that the spins of the target Hamiltonians are 2-level, since a q-level variable can always be embedded into $\lceil \log_2 q \rceil$ 2-level variables. For simplicity, we will also assume that the spins of the universal Hamiltonian are 2-level (this can easily be generalised at the expense of some notation).

We denote by $H(\sigma)$ the energy of configuration σ under Hamiltonian H. H_S denotes a Hamiltonian acting on a set of spins S. If σ is a configuration of all the spins in the set $S \cup A$, then σ_S denotes the restriction of σ to the set of spins S. Now we are ready to give a precise definition of Hamiltonian simulation.

Definition 1 (Hamiltonian Simulation) *We say that a spin model can* simulate *a Hamiltonian H' if it satisfies* all three *of the following:*

(i). For any $\Delta > \max_{\sigma'} H'(\sigma')$ there exists a Hamiltonian H from the model whose low-lying energy levels $\{E_\sigma = H(\sigma) : E_k < \Delta\}$ are identical to the energy levels $\{E'_{\sigma'} = H'(\sigma')\}$ of H'.

(ii). There exists a fixed subset S of the spins of H such that, for all $E_k < \Delta$, the configuration σ_S of S in the energy E_k state of H is identical to the configuration σ' in the energy $E'_k = E_k$ state of H'.

(iii). The partition function $Z_H(\beta) = \sum_\sigma e^{-\beta H(\sigma)}$ of H reproduces the partition function $Z_{H'}(\beta) = \sum_{\sigma'} e^{-\beta H'(\sigma')}$ of H' up to rescaling, to within exponentially small additive error: $Z_{H'}(\beta) = dZ_H(\beta) + O(e^{-\Delta})$ for some constant d.

Definition 2 (Universal Model) *We say that a model is* universal *if, for any Hamiltonian $H' = \sum_{i=1}^m h_i$ on n spins composed of m separate k-body terms, H' can be simulated by some Hamiltonian H from the model specified by* $\mathrm{poly}(m, 2^k)$ *parameters and acting on* $\mathrm{poly}(n, m, 2^k)$ *spins.*

That is, we demand that the overhead incurred by simulating a target Hamiltonian using a universal model is polynomial with respect to the number of parameters required to describe the target Hamiltonian. Note that, in general, a target Hamiltonian H' on n spins can be n-body, requiring 2^n parameters to specify it. In this case, any Hamiltonian that simulates it will necessarily have to contain at least 2^n parameters. On the other hand, if the target Hamiltonian is made up of m k-body terms, it can be described by $m2^k$ parameters. In this case, our definition of universality requires that the universal model should only contain $\mathrm{poly}(m, 2^k)$ parameters.

Note also that we allow for the partition function to be rescaled by a constant d, since H has generally more degrees of freedom than H', so that its partition function may scale differently. For $\Delta = \infty$, this amounts to a global energy shift.

Up to now, we have placed no restriction whatsoever on what a spin model can look like; it could consist of an arbitrary collection of completely unrelated Hamiltonians. However, in any reasonable spin model we expect there to be some relationship between different Hamiltonians within the same model. The following definition imposes some additional structure on spin models, such that different Hamiltonians in the same model are at least loosely related.

Definition 3 (Closed Model) *We say that a spin model is* closed *if, for any pair of Hamiltonians H^1_{AB} and H^2_{BC} in the model acting on arbitrary sets of spins $A \cup B$ and $B \cup C$, respectively, there exists a Hamiltonian in the model which simulates $H^1_{AB} + H^2_{BC}$.*

If the model places no constraints on the interaction graph (e.g. it consists of k-body terms that are not geometrically local), then it is trivially closed: simply take the union of the interaction sets. Closure becomes a non-trivial property only for spin models in which the form of the interaction graph is restricted in some way (e.g. to a planar graph, or to a square lattice).

Now we consider polynomial-time reductions between decision problems, but we need a reduction which additionally preserves the structure of the witnesses:[4]

Definition 4 (Faithful reduction) *We say that a reduction from* SAT *to the* Ground State Energy *problem of a spin model is* faithful *if there exists an identification between Boolean variables and a fixed subset S of the spins, such that the ground state configuration of S corresponds to a satisfying assignment of the* SAT *problem.*

An important example of a spin model that is both closed and has a faithful polynomial-time reduction from SAT is the 2D Ising model with local fields. That it admits a faithful reduction is immediate from chaining together the reduction from SAT to Vertex Cover [1] with Barahona's reduction from Vertex Cover to Ground State Energy for the 2D Ising model with fields [2]. The fact that the model is closed follows from the "crossing gadget" used in the reduction from Vertex Cover to Planar Vertex Cover [3], along with the fact that the ferromagnetic Ising interaction can be used to force the configurations of neighbouring spins to be identical in the ground state.

Theorem 5 (Main result) *A spin model is universal if and only if it is closed and its* Ground State Energy *problem admits a polynomial-time faithful reduction from* SAT.

Proof The "only if" direction is trivial. The closure part follows immediately from the definition of universality (Definition 2): the model must be able to simulate *any* H^1_{AB}, H^2_{BC} and $H = H^1_{AB} + H^2_{BC}$, including any H^1_{AB} and H^2_{BC} that are in



FIG. 1: The proof of Theorem 5 for the case $k = 2$, here for $x = 3$. Step 1 introduces auxiliary spins A_i and b_i, and Steps 2 and 3, B_i and C_i, respectively, for all i. Note that we do not assume any structure in the interactions of the spins.

the universal model itself. The faithful reduction part follows immediately from the fact that the 2D Ising model with fields admits a faithful reduction from SAT: one Hamiltonian that must be simulatable by the universal model is the 2D Ising Hamiltonian.

To prove the "if" direction, it will be sufficient to show that we can simulate a single k-body Hamiltonian term. We will then apply this to each term in the Hamiltonian separately, and use closure of the model to assemble the resulting simulations of the local terms into a simulation of the full Hamiltonian. We therefore focus initially on a k-body target Hamiltonian H'. We will first prove that the model satisfies Parts (i) and (ii) of Definition 1, before extending the construction to prove Part (iii).

To achieve the required separation of energy scales (cf. Definition 1), we will use the reduction from SAT three times, and combine the resulting Hamiltonians (see Fig. 1). Each use of the reduction will in general introduce new auxiliary spins (see Definition 4). We assume without loss of generality that the reduction gives a Hamiltonian whose ground state energy is 0, and all excited states have energy at least 1, as this can always be achieved by shifting and rescaling the energy.

Let $\{e_i(x) : \mathbb{Z}_2^k \to \mathbb{Z}_2\}$ be the elementary basis for Boolean functions on k bits, $e_i(x) = 1$ iff $x = i$, and expand the target Hamiltonian in terms of this basis: $H'(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} E_i e_i(x)$ where $E_i = H'(i)$. The notation $a \odot b := \overline{a \oplus b}$ denotes the Boolean exclusive-nor operation, i.e. $a \odot b = 1$ if and only if $a = b$.

Step 1 We apply the reduction to the Boolean formula $e_i(\sigma_S) \odot \sigma_{b_i}$, for $i = 1, \ldots, 2^k$, where b_i is a single auxiliary "flag" spin. This gives a Hamiltonian H_1^i acting on spins $S \cup b_i \cup A_i$ such that

$$\begin{cases} H_1^i(\sigma) = 0 & \sigma_{b_i} = e_i(\sigma_S),\ \sigma_{A_i} \in \Sigma_{A_i}^{b_i} \\ H_1^i(\sigma) \geq 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

for some non-empty sets of configurations $\Sigma_{A_i}^b$ of the auxiliary A_i spins.

Step 2 We apply the reduction to the Boolean formula which forces the flag spin to be 0: $\sigma_{b_i} \odot 0$. This gives a Hamiltonian H_2^i acting on spins $b_i \cup B_i$ such that

$$\begin{cases} H_2^i(\sigma) = 0 & \sigma_{b_i} = 0,\ \sigma_{B_i} \in \Sigma_{B_i} \\ H_2^i(\sigma) \geq 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where Σ_{B_i} is some non-empty set of configurations of the auxiliary B_i spins. In particular, choose an arbitrary configuration $\sigma_{B_i}^\star$ and let

$$\kappa_i := H_2^i(\sigma_{b_i} = 1, \sigma_{B_i} = \sigma_{B_i}^\star) \geq 1\,. \tag{3}$$

Note that computing κ_i requires computing an energy level of the Hamiltonian H_2^i. Since H_2^i is constructed by reduction from a formula involving only a single variable, this is a Hamiltonian on a *constant* number of spins, so κ_i can be computed in constant time [5].

Step 3 We apply the reduction to the Boolean formula which forces the configuration of B_i to be $\sigma_{B_i}^\star$ if $\sigma_{b_i} = 1$, and does nothing if $\sigma_{b_i} = 0$:

$$((\sigma_{b_i} \odot 1) \wedge (\sigma_{B_i} \odot \sigma_{B_i}^\star)) \vee (\sigma_{b_i} \odot 0). \tag{4}$$

This gives Hamiltonian H_3^i acting on spins $B_i \cup C_i$ such that

$$\begin{cases} H_3^i(\sigma) = 0 & \sigma_{b_i} = 1,\ \sigma_{B_i} = \sigma_{B_i}^\star,\ \sigma_{C_i} \in \Sigma_{C_i}^1 \\ H_3^i(\sigma) = 0 & \sigma_{b_i} = 0,\ \sigma_{C_i} \in \Sigma_{C_i}^0 \\ H_3^i(\sigma) \geq 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

for some non-empty sets of configurations $\Sigma_{C_i}^b$ of the auxiliary C_i spins.

By rescaling these Hamiltonians and adding them together, we construct the following Hamiltonian (which can be simulated by a Hamiltonian within the same model, since the model is closed by assumption):

$$\begin{aligned} H(\sigma) =& \Delta \sum_i H_1^i(\sigma_S, \sigma_{b_i}, \sigma_{A_i}) + \sum_i \frac{E_i}{\kappa_i} H_2^i(\sigma_{b_i}, \sigma_{B_i}) \\ &+ \Delta \sum_i H_3^i(\sigma_{b_i}, \sigma_{B_i}, \sigma_{C_i}). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

From Eqs. (1), (2) and (5), $H(\sigma)$ evaluated on a configuration with $\sigma_S = x$, $\sigma_{A_i} \in \Sigma_{A_i}$, $\sigma_{b_i} = e_i(x)$, $\sigma_{B_i} = \sigma_{B_i}^\star$ for $i = x$ and $\sigma_{B_i} \in \Sigma_{B_i}$ for $i \neq x$, $\sigma_{C_i} \in \Sigma_{C_i}^{e_i(x)}$ gives energy E_x. For all other configurations, $H(\sigma) \geq \Delta$. So H simulates the low-lying energy levels and configurations of H', as required (see Fig. 2). This proves that the model satisfies Parts (i) and (ii) of Definition 1.

Partition Function It remains to prove Part (iii) of Definition 1. The previous construction of H simulates the energy levels and corresponding configurations of the target Hamiltonian H'. However, it does not necessarily reproduce the correct partition function. Even though each energy level E_k



FIG. 2: The proof of Theorem 5. The upper side corresponds to $i \neq x$, and the lower to $i = x$. The first, second and third column illustrate the spectrum of H after adding the first, second and third term in (6), respectively. Note that after the third step the spectrum of H below Δ coincides with that of H'. The ground state (or low-lying) configurations are indicated at each step.

corresponds to a unique configuration σ_S of spins S [6], the construction introduces additional auxiliary spins at various points. There may be multiple possible configurations of these auxiliary spins for the same energy E_k, and this degeneracy could be different for different energy levels, in which case H will not reproduce the partition function of H'.

Thus, we must modify the construction to ensure that the auxiliary spins introduce the *same* degeneracy for each energy level below the cut-off Δ. The idea is to introduce additional auxiliary spins and additional terms in the Hamiltonian, which do not change the energy levels or configurations of the physical spins S, but which increase the degeneracy of each energy level in such a way that all the degeneracies are identical.

Step 1' We use the shorthand notation $|A_i| \equiv |\Sigma_{A_i}|$. From Eq. (1), the number of zero-energy configurations of H_1 with $\sigma_S = x$ is given by $|A_x^1| \prod_{i \neq x} |A_i^0|$, which could depend on x. By introducing 2^k copies of S and symmetrising over all 2^k cyclic permutations of the terms H_1^i that couple to the flag spins, we can increase this degeneracy to $\prod_i |A_i^1||A_i^0|^{2^k-1}$, which is independent of x.

More precisely, we introduce 2^k-1 auxiliary copies S_j of the physical spins S, and denote $S \equiv S_0$. Define the Hamiltonian $H_1^{i,j} = H_1^{i-j}$ (cf. Eq. (1)) acting on spins $S_j \cup b_i \cup A_{i,j}$, where the difference $i-j$ is taken modulo 2^k. (So in particular $H_1^{i,0} = H_1^i$.) Construct the overall Hamiltonian $H_1 = \sum_{i,j=0}^{2^k} H_1^{i,j}$ by



FIG. 3: The modified construction for the proof of Theorem 5 for $x = 3$ (encircled in yellow). We reuse the flag spins $\sigma_{b_j(i)}$ as $\sigma_{b_{\pi(j)}(\pi(i))}$ where π is a cyclic permutation of $(1, 2, 3, 4)$. The two spins encircled in dashed lines in each row are the same as that to its left. This induces a degeneracy of auxiliary spins of the first Hamiltonian which is constant for all σ_S.

combining all of these terms. Each flag spin b_i is now coupled to 2^k copies of S, by all possible 2^k Hamiltonian terms from Eq. (1) (see Fig. 3).

The $H_1^{i,0} = H_1^i$ terms couple the original set of physical spins $S_0 \equiv S$ to the flag spins, by exactly the same Hamiltonians as in our previous construction. So, exactly as before, for a given configuration $\sigma_S = x$ of the physical spins, the flag spin b_i is forced to take the value $\sigma_{b_i} = e_i(x)$ (Eq. (1)), and there are $|A_{i,0}^{e_i(x)}| = |A_i^{e_i(x)}|$ possible configurations of the auxiliary $A_{i,0} \equiv A_i$ spins.

We must show that this is consistent with the constraints imposed by all the new terms $H_1^{i,j\neq 0}$. Consider the S_j copy of S. It is coupled to flag spin b_x by $H_1^{x,j} = H_1^{x-j}$. But $\sigma_{b_x} = 1$, so by Eq. (1) the only zero-energy configuration of S_j is $\sigma_{S_j} = x - j$. All other $\sigma_{b_{i\neq x}} = 0$, and $i - j \neq x - j$ for $i \neq x$, so this configuration satisfies the constraints imposed by all other $H_1^{i,j} = H_1^{i-j}$. Thus there exists a unique zero-energy configuration for each of the other S_j copies, with $|A_{i,j}^{e_i(x)}| = |A_{i-j}^{e_i(x)}|$ possible configurations of the corresponding auxiliary $A_{i,j}$ spins.

The configuration σ_S of the physical spins uniquely determines $\sigma_{\cup_i b_i}$. Thus the sets of zero-energy configurations of the $A_{i,j}$ are independent given σ_S. Since the sets $A_{i,j}$ are also completely disjoint, the total degeneracy of the zero-energy configurations with $\sigma_S = x$ is given by the product of all the individual degeneracies:

$$\prod_{i,j} |A_{i,j}^{e_i(x)}| = \prod_{i,j} |A_{i-j}^{e_i(x)}| = \prod_{i,j} |A_j^{e_i(x)}| = \prod_j |A_j^1||A_j^0|^{2^k-1}, \quad (7)$$

which is independent of the configuration $\sigma_S = x$ of the physical spins, as claimed. H_1 will be multiplied by Δ, so all non-zero energy configurations of H_1 have energy $\geq \Delta$, and their degeneracies do not concern us.

Steps 2' and 3' We leave the Hamiltonians H_2 and H_3 from Eqs. (2) and (5) unchanged. Note that all the terms H_2^i from Eq. (2) are the same Hamiltonian, just acting on different subsets of spins $b_i \cup B_i$ (which implies that all κ_i in fact take the

same value κ). Similarly for the terms H_3^i from Eq. (5), acting on subsets $b_i \cup C_i$. Furthermore, for given i and j, the terms $H_1^{i+n,j+n} = H_1^{i-j}$ constructed above are the same Hamiltonian for all n, just acting on different subsets of spins $S_j \cup b_i \cup A_{i,j}$. Let π_n be a cyclic permutation with shift n of the 2^k blocks $S_i \cup b_i \cup A_i \cup B_i \cup C_i$. Applying π_n to the overall Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \Delta \sum_i H_1^{i,j} + \sum_i \frac{E_i}{\kappa_i} H_2^i + \Delta \sum_i H_3^i \\ &= \Delta \sum_i H_1^{i-j} + \sum_i \frac{E_i}{\kappa} H_2^i + \Delta \sum_i H_3^i \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

transforms it into

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_n H &= \Delta \sum_i H_1^{i+n,j+n} + \sum_i \frac{E_i}{\kappa_i} H_2^{i+n} + \Delta \sum_i H_3^{i+n} \\ &= \Delta \sum_i H_1^{i-j} + \sum_i \frac{E_{i+n}}{\kappa} H_2^i + \Delta \sum_i H_3^i. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Now, from Eqs. (2) and (5), we know that a low-energy configuration of H with energy $E_k < \Delta$ must be a zero-energy configuration of H_1, H_3, and all of the H_2^i terms except H_2^k. Thus if σ is a low-energy configuration of H with energy E_k, comparing Eqs. (8) and (9) we see that it must also be a low-energy configuration of $\pi_n H$ with energy E_{k+n}. But $H(\pi_n^{-1}(\sigma)) = \pi_n H(\sigma) = E_{k+n}$, which implies that $\pi_n^{-1}(\sigma)$ is a low-energy configuration of H with energy E_{k+n}. Since π_n is bijective, the low-energy configurations with energy E_k are therefore in one-to-one correspondence with low-energy configurations with energy E_{k+n}, so these energy levels have the same degeneracy. This holds for any cyclic permutation π_n, thus all energy levels have the same degeneracy, as required.

We have shown that the Hamiltonian H from our modified construction Eq. (8) reproduces the low-lying energy levels and configurations of any target Hamiltonian, and that the degeneracy d is the same for all low-lying energy levels $E_i < \Delta$. Thus, not only does it satisfy Parts (i) and (ii) of Definition 1, as before, but also $Z_H(\beta) = \sum_\sigma e^{-\beta H(\sigma)} = d \sum_{E_i<\Delta} e^{-\beta E_i} + \sum_{E_i \geq \Delta} e^{-\beta E_i} = dZ_{H'} + O(e^{-\Delta})$. Thus H satifies Part (iii), too. Since H is a sum of Hamiltonians $H_1^{i,j}$, H_2^i and H_3^i from the model, by the closure assumption (Definition 3) it can itself be simulated by a Hamiltonian from the model.

So far, we have simulated a single k-body Hamiltonian H', using a Hamiltonian H on $n + O(2^k)$ spins with 2^k parameters E_i. To simulate an arbitrary k-body target Hamiltonian $H' = \sum_{n=1}^m h_n$ made up of m separate k-body terms h_n, we simply use the above construction for each h_n individually. The resulting Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{n=1}^{m} \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} \left(\Delta H_{n,1}^{i,j} + \frac{E_{n,i}}{\kappa_i} H_{n,2}^i + \Delta H_{n,3}^i \right) \tag{10}$$

simulates H', using $n + \text{poly}(m, 2^k)$ spins and $m2^k$ parameters $E_{n,i}$ (where the subscripts n denote the Hamiltonians coming from applying the above construction to the term h_n). Again by closure, H can be simulated by a Hamiltonian from the model. This completes the proof of Theorem 5. □

Since the 2D Ising model with fields satisfies the requirements of Theorem 5, this implies that one of the simplest 2D models, with only one- and two-body interactions on a lattice, is already universal.

Corollary 6 *The 2D Ising model with fields is universal.*

[1] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson, *Computers and intractability* (W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1979).

[2] F. Barahona, J. Phys. A **15**, 3241 (1982).

[3] M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson, and L. Stockmeyer, Theoretical Computer Science **1**, 237 (1976).

[4] We could use any NP-complete problem in the definition instead of SAT, or indeed define it directly in terms of witnesses. But this just makes the identification between witnesses and spins in the definition more complicated, for little gain.

[5] Strictly speaking, in Definition 2 we do not actually require the Hamiltonian to be *constructable* in polynomial-time, only that it has polynomial overhead in terms of the number of spins and parameters.

[6] Even if an energy level is degenerate, each of those degenerate energy levels will correspond to a unique σ_S.